



SCOTT FITZPATRICK MISSOURI STATE AUDITOR

Richland R-1 School District Investigative Summary

Summary of Significant Complaint(s) reported:

The Missouri State Auditor's Office (SAO) Whistleblower Hotline received a complaint regarding the Richland R-1 School District's Board of Education's procurement of a roof replacement project contractor.

Background:

The Richland R-1 School District is located in Stoddard County. The school district was organized in 1962 and is comprised of one elementary school (pre-K through 6th grade) and one high school (7th through 12th grade). Enrollment for the 2024-2025 school year was 266.

District policy and Section 177.086, RSMo, require all school facilities construction projects exceeding \$50,000 be advertised and awarded to the best bidder whose bid is in accordance with the Board-approved plans and specifications. Policy also states the Board of Education may award the contract to any one of the bidders at the Board's discretion.

Methodology:

To investigate the complaint, we reviewed district procurement policies and procedures, bid documentation, and open and closed meeting minutes related to a roofing project, which is the subject of the complaint received.

Complaint Review:

Our review determined the Board followed applicable procurement policies and statute in selecting the roofing contractor for the relevant project. The Board voted to request bids for a roofing project in November 2025. The district advertised the project in the *Dexter Statesman* newspaper for two consecutive weeks in December 2025 and received sealed bids from 6 roofing companies in January 2026.

The RFP required responsive bidders to submit specific documentation including a proposal letter and manufacturer's data sheets on each product used. Required documentation included (1) preparation instructions and recommendations, (2) storage and handling requirements and recommendations, and (3) installation instructions. In addition, each roofing company was required to submit formal drawings, a bid bond, and design pressure calculations. Our review of bid documentation noted the Board appropriately used a scoring worksheet to document the Board's review. Only two firms met the RFP requirements, and the Board selected the firm with the lower bid price, in accordance with policy and statute.

Conclusion:

It appears the Board has proper procurement and bidding procedures in place and followed applicable policy and statute when selecting the roofing project contractor. We will issue a closure letter indicating no further investigation will be pursued.